CONTENTS

Kuravi Rāma's *DAŚARŪPAKA-PADDHATI*

*INTRODUCTION

In the beginning of Kuravi Rāma's unpublished commentary on the *Viśvaguṇādarśacampū* the following two verses occur

yaccetaś candracūḍe tatapariḳalanād
bhṛṅgakīṭāyamānam,
yenākāry appayādhvaryuditakuvalayānandaṭīp-
pany amoghā |
yaś campūbhāratīyām atanuta vivṛtim
svādyagūḍhārthasāram,
vyutpitsor daśarūpīty avahad iha mudam paddhatir
vā yadiyā ||
bhrātuḥ sāhityakalām saṅgopāṅgām adhītya
gopālāt |
viśvaguṇādarśam sa vyākhyāti śrīkuravirāmaḥ ||
(Hultzsch, Report, I, extract 21, p 57)

The first line in the *Daśarūpaka-Paddhati* running as

anavadhikaruṇāvāridhim ānamyātmani sadāśivam
devam

shows that Kuravi Rāma was a devotee of Śiva, and the first line of the first verse quoted above refers to his deep and extensive meditation on his personal Deity, and thereby he seems to imply his consequent feeling of the Almighty's presence always, as

*A major part of this Introduction was read at the 27th International Congress of Orientalists in Ann Arbor, Michigan, on Wednesday, the 16th of August, 1967, in Section 3 South Asia in Ancient and Classical Times.

he mentions in this context that his mind was like an example of the *bhramarakitanyaya* [1] In the

1 The maxim of *bhramarakīṭa* refers to the case of an insect which having once been stung by a highly poisonous wasp remains always thinking of the wasp through deadly fear of being stung again and as a result sees the wasp in everything and finally gets metamorphosed into the form of the latter The case is generally cited to emphacize the belief in the efficacy of meditation The two following verses of Śankaracarya from his *Vivekacudamani* explain the significance of the *bhramarakita-nyaya*

sati sakto naro yati sadbhavam hy ekanisthaya |
kitako bhramaram dhyayan bhramaratvaya kalpate (359)
krijantarasaktim apasya kitako
dhyayan yathalim hy alibhavam rcchati |
tathaiv yogi paramatmatattvam
dhyatva samayati tadekanisthaya || (360)

I understand that the *bhramara* or *bhrnga* or *ali* of the *bhramarakiṭa nyaya* is not the generally known type of bee but the words in this context refer to a poisonous wasp which is also one of the allied species Many opinions and theories of the past do not seem to be acceptable to the modern scientists It is therefore no wonder and it is a different thing if the modern biologists should regard as fanciful the explanation of the so called *bhramarakita nyaya* mentioned by Śankaracarya and others

Though the verses of Śankaracarya refer to the change of form finally into that of *the object* of meditation Kuravi Rama s statement may perhaps be taken to refer to his deep and extensive meditation on his personal Deity and his consequent feeling of the Almighty s presence everywhere A somewhat similar description of Kamsa s seeing Kṛṣna everywhere is found in the following verse of the *Bhagavata* *asinah samvisams tisthan bhunjanah paryatan mahim* |
cintayano hrsikesam apaśyat tanmayam jagat || *Bhaga* X 2 28
It is not clear whether Kuravi Rama s statement of *bhrnga kiṭajamanatva* has reference to any situation in his personal life or the simile is intended only to refer to the aspect of his constant meditation I am indebted to Sri P N P Sastriar for the information on the two verses of Sankaracarya quoted above I also learn from my friend Mr G Ramasubba Sarma that Allasani Peddana a Telugu poet of the 16th century makes use of the *bhramarakiṭa nyaya* in his well known work *Marucaritramu* (2 33)

second and third lines of the same verse he speaks of his commentary on the *Kuvalayananda* of Appayyadikṣita and on the *Campūbharata*[2] In the fourth line he mentions his *Daśarūpī Paddhati* (the present work) In the second verse he says that he learnt the *sāhitya-kalā* from his brother Gopāla

As he wrote a commentary on the *Viśvaguṇādarśa* of Venkatādhvarin (of *circa* 1637 A D) and as in his commentary the *Makarandajhari* on the *Kuvalayānanda* he criticizes vehemently the views and interpretations of Vaidyanātha Tatsat (1683 A.D), the author of the *Candrikā*, another commentary on the *Kuvalayananda*, Kuravi Rāma could not have been earlier than the last part of the 17th century E Hultzsch says in his Report, I, that our author is said to have lived at the court of one of the Zamindars of Kārvetinagaram (then) in the North Arcot District Kuravi Rāma is also reported to have translated the *Vasavadatta* (of Subandhu?) into Telugu under the title of *Vāsavadatta-pariṇayam* In his *Makarandajhari* Kuravi *Rāma* says as follows

kāvyaprakāśamukhalakṣanapāradṛśvā
kalyānanavyabahukāvyavidhānacuñcuh |
sāhityasāranidhir appayadīkṣitīya-
vyākhyām imam kuravirāmakavir vidhatte ||

2 His commentary on the *Campubhārata* known as *lasya* was published many times by the Nirnayasagara Press, Bombay, of which I was able to get the fifth edition (1950) The title page of this edition, perhaps it was so in other editions too, is misleading as it mentions the commentator as Ramacandra Budhendra instead of Kuravi Rama or Kuravi Ramakavi The commentator on the *Campuramāyana* is known as Ramacandra Budhendra The author of the *lasya* on the *Campubharata* is different from Ramacandra-Budhendra, and must be mentioned as Kuravi Rama

He thus appears to have been a modern but prolific writer of South India, and a man of great erudition[3]

Kuravi Rāma's *Daśarūpaka-Paddhati* is not a commentary on the *Daśarūpaka*, as was mentioned by some scholars, but is an independent work on dramaturgy. As the author says in the beginning of the work

vyutpitsumude kathayati daśarūpakavartma
kuravirāmakaviḥ ||

yady api pūrvaiḥ kathitañ caitad daśarūpakādiṣu
tathāpi |

vyutpitsūnām asmin sugamāya param
mamārambhaḥ ||

his intention in writing this handbook was to make the subject of dramaturgy attractive to those who were desirous of learning it without much trouble, although it had been dealt with by previous writers in works such as the *Daśarūpaka* (in which only after some patient efforts one could expect the pleasure of under-

3 One can see in the *lasya* his references to and discussions on the topics of various branches of Sanskrit learning For instance, see

(1)	N S P Edn 1950, page	297	(*Mīmāṃsā*)
(2)	„	304	(*Nyāya*)
(3)	„	319	(*Jyotiṣa*)
(4)	„	347	(*Vedānta*)
(5)	„	353	(*Gṛhyasutra*)
(6)	„	461	(*Chandas*)
(7)	„	73	(*Śākuna*)

In addition to these, he quotes a number of authoritative works for supporting his own views His criticisms of the interpretations of one Nṛsiṃha, another commentator on the *Campubhārata*, appear to be just and penetrating

standing) This, therefore, is a brief treatise on dramaturgy consisting of verses, mostly *anustubh*, numbering just over a hundred Kuravi Rāma says at the end as

daśottaraśataślokaır daśarūpakapaddhatıh,
darsita sadhu kuravikulaksīrāmbudhīndunā |
rāmasankhyāvata, krtyā prīyatām śankaro'nayā ||

which informs us that the work consisted of one hundred and ten verses This seems to be a round number, as there are actually one hundred and ten and a half

He obviously draws upon the *Daśarūpaka* for his *Paddhati* In his plan to compress the essentials of all the ten kinds of dramatic composition, he naturally avoids many details Many verses of the *Daśarūpaka* are incorporated by him, sometimes in full and sometimes with slight variations For instance the line in the DP

garbhas tu drstanastasya bījasyānvesanam muhuh
(67-b)

is the same as 1-36 (a) of the *Daśarūpaka* Similarly the verses 56 and 57 of the DP are again reproduced from the DR Prose passages from Dhanika's commentary on the DR are utilized by Kuravi Rāma while giving some of his own verses, and at the same time making clearer some of the compound forms used in the *Avaloka* For instance Dhanika says on 1-23

(1) *ekena prayojanenānvitānām kathāmśānām avāntaraikaprayojanasambandhah sandhih* (N S.P ed 1941, p 6)

and the verse in the DP is

ekaprayojanopetakathamśānām avantaraih |
prayojanair yah[4] *sambandhah sandhir esa tu*
pañcadha ||

(2) *parisarpapraśamavajropanyāsapuspānam prādhanyam*

is the statement of Dhanika (on 1-35, p 16), and here we have the verse as

parisarpapragamavajropanyāsās ca puspakam |
mukhyāny atra || (vv 89-90)

(3) Similarly at the end of the *mukhasandhi* Dhanika says
etesām upaksepaparikaraparinyāsayuktyudbheda-samādhānanām avasyambhavitā (*ibid* p 11)

where Kuravi Rāma has

atra cādimāh |
trayo yuktyudbhedasamādhānāny āhuh
pradhānatah || v 82

(4) On 1-43 Dhanika says
avamarsanam avamarśah paryālocanam tacca krodhena va, vyasanād vā, vilobhanena vā, ' bhavitavyam anenārthena' ityekāntaphalapraptyavasayātmā garbhasandhyudbhinna bijarthasambandho vimarśo'vamarśah (*ibid* p 21)

and on this KR s verse is

garbhasandhau prasiddhasya
bījārthasyāvamarsanam |
hetunā yena kenāpi vimarsah sandhir isyate || v 68

4 Kuravi Rāma does not always observe the so called general rule of having a short vowel in the fifth syllable of the *anustubh*

He sometimes seems to hold a view different from that of the *Nātyaśāstra* and the DR. For instance the *samavakāra* type of drama is defined in the N S. and the DR as *khyātavrtta* (i e. having a theme well-known in the epics). But Kuravi Rāma says in this connection

vīrapradhānāś ca rasā utpādyam itivrttakam (21-b)
so'sau samakavārah syād vīthyangaih kaiścid anvitah (24-a)

Vidyānātha in his *Pratāparudrīya* says about the plot of the *samavakāra as kalpitam itivrttam prasiddham vā* (Bālamanoramā Press, 1950, p 74)

Kuravi Rāma does not mention the second alternative. No other writer seems to mention that the *itivrtta* of the *samavakara* can also be *utpādya* (i e invented). Similarly, Kuravi Rāma's simple statement

śrngārādiprabhedena rasah syād astadhā

perhaps implies his unwillingness to join others in the matter of accepting even the *śāntarasa*

One or two items such as *patāksepapraveśa*, *nāndī*, and *dhruvā*, which are not mentioned in the *Daśarūpaka*, are also included in the DP (See verses 63, 64 (a), 27, 29(b) to 33). The verse 63 in the DP runs as

harsaśokādisañjātasambhramāditvarānvitam |
patāksepāt praviśati pātram;. ..... ||

In this context Ranganātha in his commentary on the *Vikramorvaśīya* says that *apatīksepa* (instead of *patīksepa*) is the correct expression. His remarks on this topic are worth quoting:

kutracıt tatah pravısantı apatīksepena ıtı pathah sa natakagranthadarśananıbandhanah yatah 'nasucıtasya patrasya praveśo nātake matah' ıtı nātakasamayaprasıddher yatra asūcıtapātrapravesas tatra akasmıkapravese apatīkṣepena ıtı vacanam yuktam atra tu prastavanante sūcıtānam eva apsarasām pravesa ıtı kecıt punah na patıksepah = apaṭıksepah ıtı vıgraham vıdhāya patıksepam vınaıva pravısantı ıtı samarthayante tad apı āpādyakucodyamatram[5] *ıty āstām tavat purūravasah pravese tu apatıksepo yuktah asūcıtatvāt apatī = javanıka, tasyāh ksepena = apasāranena apatı kāndapatah syāt pratısıra javanıka tıraskarınī ıtı halāyudhah*

(Vıkr ed by S P Pandıt, 1901, BSS, XVI, Notes, p 9)

Thus Ranganātha prefers *apatīksepa* to *patīksepa*, but he does not say anythıng about the expressıon *pataksepa*, whıch also seems to be a readıng ın some manuscrıpts See the same edıtıon, footnote readıngs on page 3 *Pata* ın *patāksepa* appears to be ın the sense of *apatī* cıted by Ranganātha Professor Monıcr Wıllıams ın hıs edıtıon of the *Śakuntala* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1876) gıves the readıng as *pataksepena*

5 I learn through a personal communıcatıon from my teacher Professor Satkarı Mookerjee that ın the works on Indıan Logıc the expressıon *āpādyakucodyamatra* is understood thus *apadya* ıs the undesırable consequence *codya* ıs objectıon *kucodya* is a bad objectıon conceıved ın a captıous spırıt (So) What is alleged to follow as the consequent (*apādya*) is but a frıvolous ıssue—an objectıon whıch bespeaks a bad cavıllıng attıtude

(pp 144 & 230), and notes that this was the reading in many manuscripts and also according to the commentator Kātayavema There is a close resemblance between Kātayavema's explanation *patāksepena* = *yavanikapanodanena* = *akasmāt, harsaśokadyayita-sambhramayuktasya natasya pravesah patāksepena kriyate*, and the verse 63 of the DP quoted above The following verse of the N S (327,, Ch 32, GOS)

> *adhruvas tu praveśāh syur gāyato rudatas tatha* |
> *sambhrame presane caiva hy utpāte vismaye tathā* ||

and one of the interpretations shown by Abhinava in his commentary on this verse, seem to be the basis for the significance of *patāksepapravesa* (i e hurried entrance of a character on the stage with a toss of the curtain) noted by Ranganātha, Kātayavema and Kuravi Rāma The reading *apatāksepakrtā* (*apatiksepakrtā*?) in the verse 413 in the same chapter of the N S (GOS) seems to be dubious Even if it be proved to be genuine, the word *āksepa* of the reading may perhaps be taken as a synonym of *apakarsana* mentioned in the verse 12-3 (*ibid*) *pate caivāpakarsite*, and the expression *apatāksepakrtā* may then mean "not by the (usual) drawing aside of the curtain" (but with a toss of the curtain, to indicate the hurried entrance) This may avoid any inconsistency between the two statements of the *Nātyaśastra* Ranganātha's implied preference of the expression *apatīksepa* over *patiksepa* is perhaps due to Amara's recording as *pato'stri syat* according to which the feminine form *patī* is incorrect

Unlike the *Daśarūpaka*, the *Daśarūpaka-Paddhati* follows, while dealing subsequently with the items in

the *pratinirdesa*, the same order as that in which they were originally mentioned in the *uddesa*

In this brief compendium of dramaturgy Kuravi Rāma displays his mastery of the subject and a thorough knowledge of the *Natyaśāstra*, the *Dasarūpaka* and the *Avaloka* The DP does not contain any discussion about the *rasa*,[6] the *nāyakas* and *nāyikas*, and their companions, etc The *Daśarūpaka-Paddhati* is thus a short treatise on dramaturgy which can supply information on about 150 essential elements such as *arthaprakrtis*, *pañcāvasthās*, five *sandhis*, *sandhyangas*, *nāndī*, *dhruvā*, *patākṣepapraveśa*, *aśrāvya*, *niyataśravya*, *janānta*, *apavaritaka*, *ākāśabhāṣita*, etc, and the definitions of the ten varieties of the Sanskrit dramatic composition and their accessories

THE EDITION OF THE TEXT

This edition is based on a single Palm-Leaf Manuscript of the text in Telugu characters preserved in the Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, with the number MSR 820 (c) I am happy to express my grateful acknowledgements to Śri R K Pārthasārathi, the Curator of the Library for his kind permission to me to have a copy of the work

While editing the text I have sometimes used some of the modern punctuation-marks such as comma and semicolon If in an uneven part of a verse a unit of sense is found to be complete I have used the semicolon to indicate the completion of the sentence and

6 There is only the following statement *śrṅgāradiprabhedena rasah syad aṣṭadha*

the fact that the portion preceding the semicolon is not connected with the subsequent expression. At the end of the first half of a verse I have used one sroke, and two strokes at the end of the second.

I would express my gratitude to the Chairman of the Department of East Asian Studies, and the authorities of the Research Administration of the University of Toronto, whose generous grant enabled me to travel and collect some unpublished manuscript materials, one of which was the text of the *Daśarūpaka-Paddhati,* now being presented with Occasional Notes in the following pages.

श्री कुरविरामकृता

दशरूपकपद्धतिः

श्रीगुरुभ्यो नमः

अनवधिकरुणावारिधिमानम्यात्मनि सदाशिवं देवम्।
व्युत्पित्सुमुदे कथयति दशरूपकवर्त्म कुपविरामकविः ॥ १ ॥

यद्यपि [1]पूर्वैः कथितश्चैतद् दशरूपकादिषु तथापि।
व्युत्पित्सूनामस्मिन् सुगमाय परं समारम्भः ॥ २ ॥

नटैः प्रतिनिधीभूय स्वैः स्वैरभिनयैः स्फुटम्।
सभायां नेतृचारित्ररूपणाद् रूपकं मतम् ॥ ३ ॥

धीरोदात्तादिभेदेन नायको बहुधा मतः।
नेतृणां चरितं प्राज्ञैरितिवृत्तमितीर्यते ॥ ४ ॥

प्रख्यातोत्पाद्यमिश्रप्रभेदात् तत् त्रिविधं मतम्।
भारतादौ प्रसिद्धं तु प्रख्यातं; कविकल्पितम् ॥ ५ ॥

1 The reading in the MS is not clear It looks like *yady api pūrvam (or pūrvaire) .... taddaśarūpkādisu tathāpi*

उत्पाद्यम्; एतत्साङ्कर्यान् मिश्रं; सर्वं रसाश्रयम्।
शृङ्गारादिप्रभेदेन रसः स्यादष्टधा; त्विमौ ॥ ६॥

अन्यत्रविस्तरेणोक्तावितिति नात्र प्रपञ्चितौ।
नायकादिप्रभेदेन रूपकं दशधा विदुः॥ ७॥

नाटकं च प्रकरण भाणः[2] प्रहसनं डिमः।
व्यायोगवीथिसमवकाराङ्केहामृगा दश ॥ ८॥

सन्धिवृत्त्यन्विता सर्वे; सन्धिरग्रे प्रदर्श्यते।
कैशिक्याद्या वृत्तयस्तु; तासामन्यत्र विस्तरः ॥ ९॥

धीरोदात्तो यत्र नेता शृङ्गारो वीर एव वा।
रसः प्रधानम्, अन्येषां यथायोगमवस्थितिः ॥ १०॥

2 The reading here seems to be in neuter as *bhāṇam*; but later on (v 13) masculine form is clearly given

प्रख्यातं वृत्तकं, सर्वे सन्धयस्तत्तु नाटकम् ।
यत्र नेता धीरशान्तः शृङ्गारस्य प्रधानता ॥ ११ ॥

पूर्ववच्चान्यद्.उत्पा(द्यं) वृत्तं प्रकरणं हि तत् ।
नेता धूर्तविटो[3] यत्र सन्धौ तु मुखनिर्वहौ ॥ १२ ॥

उत्पाद्यवृत्तम् (एकोऽ)ङ्कः सूच्यशृङ्गारवीरकः ।
स भाणो ; यत्र हास्यं तु रसोऽन्यद् भाणवद् भवेत् ॥ १३ ॥

शुद्धवैकृतसङ्कीर्णभेदात् प्रहसनं[4] त्रिधा ।
पाषण्डविप्रप्रभृतिचेटचेटीविटाकुलम् ॥ १४ ॥

वेषभाषादिसहितं शुद्धं हास्यवचोऽन्वितम् ।
कामुकादि(वचो)वेषैः षण्ढकञ्चुकितापसैः ॥ १५ ॥

3 In the DR *dhūrta* is not found as an adjective to the *vita* But the NŚ has *dhūrtaviṭasamprayojyaḥ* (GOS, 18-110).

4 See the DR 3-54 and 55, p 74

कृतप्रहासाभिनय चिकृतं; वीथिलक्षणम् ।
सङ्कीर्णं, [5]यत्र प्रसिद्धं घृत्त रौद्ररसो भवेत् ॥ १६ ॥

अन्येषां हास्यशृङ्गारवर्जानामङ्गता पुन ।
नायका देवगन्धर्वपिशाचोरगराक्षसा ॥ १७ ॥

भूतप्रेतमुखा दृप्ताः सन्धयो मर्शवर्जिताः ।
चत्वारोऽङ्का डिमस्य ; स्यादेको यत्र तु नायकः ॥ १८ ॥

5 If *yatra* is connected with previous expression, than the usual construction should have been by mentioning the *tat* and in a correct order as that *saṅkīrṇam* (*ucyate*) *vithilakṣaṇam yatra* (*asti*), or it would be better if the derivatives of *yat* and *tat* are left out as Dhanika says *vīthyaṅgaiḥ* (*saṅkīrṇatvāt*) *saṅkīrṇam* If on the other hand *yatra* is connected with the subsequent portion, as he generally does while introducing a new item (see v 20), then also express mentioning of a form of *tat* is required according to Mammaṭa Or we should take it that K R. does not agree with Mammaṭa and so a suitable form should be supplied See for a discussion on the usages of *yat* and *tat* my paper 'Gleanings from the *Kāśikāvṛtti*', Journal of the Assam Research Society, v XIV, p 106

सन्धयोऽगर्भमर्शाः स्यु, कथा स्यादेकवासरा ।
मायिकी,[6] डिमवच्चान्यत् स व्यायोगः स्मृतो बुधैः ॥ १९ ॥

यत्रेतिवृत्तम् उत्पाद्यम् अङ्कक्लृप्तिस्तु भाणवत् ।
शृङ्गारोऽपरिपूर्णश्च सा वीथिरिति कीर्तिता ॥ २० ॥

यत्र द्वादश नेतारः [7]फलदेवासुरादयः ।
धीरप्रधानाश्च रसा [8]उत्पाद्य मितिवृत्तकम् ॥ २१ ॥

सन्धयो मर्शहीनाः स्युस्त्रयोऽङ्कास्ते पुनः क्रमात् ।
त्रैयामिकोत्सर्गदेशा[9][युंत्य]च्छन्नकथान्विकः ॥ २२ ॥

6 The reading in the MS is not clear What is given above is my guess

7 The verses dealing with *samavakāra* are a bit cumbersome The reading in the MS in place is *caladevāsurādayah,* of which *cala* is not clear in meaning The DR and other texts record about the *phala* of the *nāyakas* in the *samavakāra* as "*phalam teṣām (dvādasanāyakānām) pṛthak pṛthak* Therefore I think that the expression intended was perhaps *phaladevāsurādayah* (taking the compound form to mean *phalayuktāh devāsurādayah*)

8 See the Introduction on *itivṛtta* being *utpādya* in the *samavakāra*

9 As the author himself states *trayo'nkās te punah kramāt,* the three Acts in the *samavakāra* are to be respectively of the duration of three *yāmas,* one *yāma,* and of half *yāma* But the three lines containing the expressions *traiyā-*

[10]यामिकाग्निनिरोधादिनिमित्तोपद्रवत्रिकः ।
अर्धयामिकशृङ्गारधर्मादिकथात्रिकः ॥ २३ ॥

सोऽसौ समवकारः स्याद् वीथ्यङ्गैः कैश्चिदन्वितः ।
प्राकृतो नायको यत्र प्रधानः करुणो रसः ॥ २४ ॥

प्रख्यातं वृत्तमङ्कस्य, [11]सन्ध्यङ्गौ भाणवन्मतौ ।
नेता धीरोद्धतो, वृत्तं मिश्रमीहामृगे; रसः ॥ २५ ॥

[12]शृङ्गाराभासो, मुखाद्या सन्धयोऽङ्कद्वयी[12a] त्रय ।
अथैतेषामानुपूर्वी वक्ष्ये प्रणयनान्विताम् ॥ २६ ॥

mika, *yamika*, and *ardhayamika* are examples of defective compounding as subsequent expressions in each of the lines (i e compound forms) refer to all the three *angas*, whereas the words *traiyamika* etc (which are part of the compounds) can only apply to one of the three The construction of these three long compounds is not a happy one and it looks like an unsuccessful attempt of a difficult somersault As it is illegible in the MS the reading shown within brackets is only my guess

10 MS reads with one syllable less as *yamikagninirodhanimittopadravatrikah*

11 The reading in the MS appears like *vithyankau*

12 See footnote 2 of the Introduction

12a About *ihamrga* there seem to be differences between the accounts found in the NS, the DR & the DP

तत्राद्यभिर्द्वादशभिरष्टादशभिरेव वा ।
द्वाविंशत्या पदैर्नान्दी; श्लोकः काव्यार्थसूचकः ॥ २७ ॥

सर्वेषामादिमोऽप्यन्येऽत्र नेच्छन्ति नियमं तथा ।
सूत्रधारस्ततो रङ्गं प्रविश्य कतिभिर्नटैः ॥ २८ ॥

ऋतुं [13]स्तुवन् [प्ररोचयेत्] सेयमुक्ता प्ररोचना ।
सूचनी पात्रभेदानां[14] रसभावप्रकाशिनी ॥ २९ ॥

गीतिर्ध्रुवा ; कार्यभेदात् पञ्चधेयं प्रकीर्त्यते ।
प्रवेशसूचिकाङ्कादौ ध्रुवा प्रावेशिकी मता ॥ ३० ॥

प्रसङ्गमध्येऽन्यार्थस्याक्षेपाद् आक्षेपिकी मता ।
नैष्क्रामिकी तु पात्राणां ध्रुवा निष्क्रामसूचिका ॥ ३१ ॥

13 MS reads as
rtum stūyan *seyam ukta prarocanā.*

14 Bhoja's statement on *dhruvā* is
seyam pātrapravesarasanusandhānadiprayojanā dhruvā
See V Raghavan's work on Ś.P, edn, 1963, p 605

[15]प्रासादिकी स्यात् पात्राणां व्याकुलानां प्रसादनात् ।
विषादे विस्मये क्रोधे प्रवेशे सङ्गमे मते ॥ ३२ ॥

दोषप्रच्छादनादौ च गीयते या तु सान्तरी ।
सूत्रधारो नटाचार्यो, रङ्गो नाट्यसभा स्मृत. ॥ ३३ ॥

नट पात्रं, तत् त्रिधा स्याद् उत्तमादिप्रभेदतः ।
उत्तमं नायकादिः स्याद्; अमात्यादिस्तु मध्यमः ॥ ३४ ॥

दासीविदूषकम्लेच्छप्रमुखं त्वधमं मतम् ।
ततः प्रस्तावना सैवामुखमित्युच्यते बुधैः ॥ ३५ ॥

सूत्रधारो नटीं ब्रूते मारिषं वा विदूषकम् ।
स्वकार्यं प्रस्तुताक्षेपि चित्रोक्त्या यत् तदामुखम् ॥ ३६ ॥

कथोद्घातः प्रवृत्तं तद् प्रयोगातिशयस्त्रिधा ।
स्वेतिवृत्तसमं वाक्यमर्थं वा यत्र सूत्रतः ॥ ३७ ॥

गृहीत्वा प्रविशेत् पात्रं स कथोद्घात ईरितः ।
प्रस्तूयमानकालस्य गुणवर्णनया स्वतः ॥ ३८ ॥

प्रविशेत् सूचितं पात्रं यत्र तत् स्यात् प्रवृत्तकम् ।
'एषोऽयम्' इत्युपक्षेपी प्रयोगातिशयो मतः ॥ ३९ ॥

वीथ्या अङ्गान्यामुखस्यापीत्येषां लक्ष्म चक्ष्महे ।
उद्घात्यकावलगिते प्रपञ्चत्रिगते छलम् ॥ ४० ॥

वाक्केल्यधिबले गण्डम् अवस्यन्दितनालिके ।
असत्प्रलापव्याहारमृदवानि त्रयोदश ॥ ४१ ॥

तत्रोद्घात्यं निगूढार्थं द्विधा प्रश्नोत्तरात्मना ।
अन्यकार्यच्छद्मनान्यकार्यस्य करणं तथा ॥ ४२ ॥

तेन प्रस्तुतकार्यस्य द्विधावलगितं मतम् ।
मिथ्यास्तोत्रं प्रपञ्चः स्यात् ; पूर्वरङ्गे नटादिभिः ॥ ४३ ॥

सम्भूयानेककार्याणां करणं त्रिगतं मतम् ।
वाक्यैर्येहि प्रियैरन्तर्विप्रियैर्लोभनं छलम् ॥ ४४ ॥

साकाङ्क्षस्यापि वाक्यस्य नटाद्यैर्यन्निवर्तनम् ।
उक्तिप्रत्युक्तिभेदेन वाक्केलिर्द्विविधा मता ॥ ४५ ॥

[16]मिथ्याक्षेपोऽधिबलं ; गण्डं प्रस्तुतबाधिवाक् ।
रसादुक्तान्यथा व्याख्या त्ववस्पन्दितमीरितम् ॥ ४६ ॥

प्रहेलिका दुर्बोधार्था[17], सोपहासा तु नालिका ।
असम्बद्धकथासत्प्रलापो ; क्षोभोपहासवाक् ॥ ४७ ॥

16 *adhibala* and *ganda* (which is given in masculine in the DR) are defined by Dhanañjaya thus
anyonyavakyadhikyoktih spardhayadhibalam bhavet
and
gandah prastutasambandhibhinnartham sahasoditam
(pp 67 & 68)

व्याहारो ; मृदवं दोषगुणीकरणमीरितम् ।
यथासम्भवमत्रैषु केषाञ्चिद् ग्राह्यतां विदुः ॥ ४८ ॥

प्रस्तावनानन्तरं स्यादितिवृत्तप्रकाशनम् ।
तच्च द्विधा भवेत् सूच्यमसूच्यं चान्तिमं पुनः ॥ ४९ ॥

दृश्यं श्राव्यमिति द्वेधा ; तथैवान्तिममेतयोः ।
अश्राव्यं नियतश्राव्यमिति द्विविधमिष्यते ॥ ५० ॥

अश्राव्यमन्यैरज्ञेयम् ; आत्मन्येव स्थितं तु यत् ।
तदात्मगतमित्युक्त्वा काव्यबन्धे निवेशयेत् ॥ ५१ ॥

यद् यकेनैव विज्ञेयं [18]नियतश्राव्यमीर्यते ।
एतच्च द्विविधं प्रोक्तं जनान्तश्चापवारितम् ॥ ५२ ॥

17. The DR says
sopahāsā nigūḍhārthā nālikaiva prahelikā (p 68).

18 Though the expression *niyataśrāvya* does not seem to occur in the N S, the two types *janānta* and *apavārita* are defined there (GOS, 25-89 & 90, p 281). See Abhinava's comment on this.

गुह्यं गुह्यतरञ्चेति जनान्तमपि च द्विधा ।
स्याज्जनान्तिकमित्युक्त्वा वाच्यं पूर्वं ; परं पुनः ॥ ५३ ॥

कर्णे एवमिवेत्युक्त्वा श्राव्य पश्चात् प्रसङ्गतः ।
प्रकाशमित्युपस्थैतेपामन्त्रेऽन्यार्थः प्रयुज्यते ॥ ५४ ॥

अप्रविष्टैः सहालापो यस्तद् आकाशभाषितम् ।
किं ब्रवीषीत्यनूद्यैतत् पश्चात् कार्यं तदुत्तरम् ॥ ५५ ॥

दूराध्वानं वधं युद्धं राज्यदेशादिविप्लवम् ।
निरोधं सुरतं स्नानं भोजनञ्चानुलेपनम् ॥ ५६ ॥

अंशुकग्रहणादीनि प्रत्यक्षाणि न निर्दिशेत् ।
समाजोद्वेगकारीति तद् एतत् सूच्यमुच्यते ॥ ५७ ॥

विष्कम्भचूलिकाङ्कास्यप्रवेशाङ्कावतारणैः ।
सूच्यस्य सूचनं पञ्चविधमाहुर्मनीषिण. ॥ ५८ ॥

वृत्तवर्तिष्यमाणानां कथांशानां निदर्शकः ।
सङ्क्षेपार्थस्तु विष्कम्भो मध्यपात्रप्रयोजितः ॥ ५९ ॥

[19]एकभाषान्वितः शुद्धो मिश्रोऽन्य इति स द्विधा ।
अन्तर्यवनिकासंस्थैश्चूलिकार्थस्य सूचना ॥ ६० ॥

19 The previous line *saṁkṣepārthas tu* etc is the same as that in the DR 1-59 About the two types of *viṣkambhaka* (Explanatory Scene) the DR and Dhanika's comment thereon run as follows

ekānekakṛtaḥ śuddhaḥ saṅkīrṇo nīcamadhyamaiḥ (1-60).
ekena dvābhyāṁ vā madhyamapātrābhyāṁ śuddho bhavati madhyamādhamapātraiṛ yugapat prayojitaḥ saṅkīrṇa iti

The N S also records similarly 18-55 The above remarks explain that the mixture of low and middle class characters makes the *saṅkīrṇa-viṣkambha* different from the pure type in which only middle class characters participate In this context the statement of the DP

ekabhāṣānvitaḥ śuddho miśro'nya iti sa dvidhā

seems to explain the difference on the basis of employment of one or more languages respectively in the pure and the mixed types of *viṣkambha* Whether Sanskrit is meant by *ekabhāṣa* or any language is not made clear Vidyānātha says clearly about these as

kevalasaṁskṛtaprāyaḥ śuddhaḥ; saṁskṛtaprākṛtamiśritaḥ saṅkīrṇaḥ (Bālamanoramā Press edn., p 82).

If this be the intention of Kuravi Rāma also, then there may not be any point of difference, as his statement would mean that Sanskrit is the language spoken in the pure type, and Sanskrit and Prakrit in the mixed type, the latter being the language generally allotted for the *nīcapātras* in all the texts

अङ्कान्तपात्रैरङ्कास्यमुत्तराङ्कार्थसूचनम् ।
नीचपात्रप्रयुक्तस्तु विष्कम्भः स्यात् प्रवेशकः ॥ ६१ ॥

[20]नैयाङ्क आद्ये ; यत्रोत्तराङ्कार्थः पूर्वसङ्गतः ।
असूचिताङ्कपात्रं तद् अङ्कावतरणं मतम् ॥ ६२ ॥

नेपथ्यं स्याद् यवनिका पात्राणां आवृतिर्मतम् ।
हर्षशोकादिसञ्जातसम्भ्रमादित्वरान्वितम् ॥ ६३ ॥

पटाक्षेपात् प्रविशति पात्रम् ; अन्यत् स्वभावतः ।
पात्रे ; दृश्यं त्वभिनयेत् सन्ध्यङ्गपरिनिष्ठितम् ॥ ६४ ॥

[21]एकप्रयोजनोपेतकथांशानामवान्तरै ।
प्रयोजनैर्य. सम्बन्ध सन्धिरेष तु पञ्चधा ॥ ६५ ॥

20 The MS reads *naiṣānka ādye* which is obviously a scribal error.
21 See the Introduction.

मुखं प्रतिमुखं गर्भो विमर्शो निर्वहस्तथा ।
मुखं बीजसमुत्पत्तिर्नानार्था रससम्भवा ॥ ६६ ॥

[22]लक्ष्यालक्ष्यस्य बीजस्य व्यक्तिः प्रतिमुखं मतम् ।
गर्भस्तु दृष्टनष्टस्य बीजस्यान्वेषणं मुहुः ॥ ६७ ॥

गर्भसन्धौ प्रसिद्धस्य बीजार्थस्यावमर्शनम् ।
हेतुना येन केनापि विमर्शः सन्धिरिष्यते ॥ ६८ ॥

बीजवन्तो मुखाद्यर्था विप्रकीर्णा यथायथम् ।
ऐकार्थ्यमुपनीयन्ते यत्र निर्वहणं हि तत् ॥ ६९ ॥

22 The DR has
lakṣyālakṣyatayodbhedas tasya pratimukham bhavet (1-30)

which is explained by Dhanika as
tasya bījasya kiñcillakṣyaḥ kiñcidalakṣya ivodbhedaḥ prakāśanam, where *lakṣyālakṣya* is taken to qualify *udbheda*, whereas the DP makes it an adjective of *bīja*.

सौख्यसम्पादनं प्राप्तिः; नैपुण्यात्करणं तु यत् ।
समाधानं, विधानं तु कारणं सुखदुःखयोः ॥ ८० ॥

परिभावनमाश्चर्यावेशो; व्यक्तं प्रकाशनम् ।
उद्भेदः स्याद्; भवेद् भेदो गुणप्रोत्साहनं; कृतिः ॥ ८१ ॥

बीजानुगुण्यात् प्रकृतकार्यारम्भोऽत्र चादिमाः ।
[26]त्रयो युक्त्युद्भेदसमाधानान्याहुः प्रधानत. ॥ ८२ ॥

तयोदशाङ्गानि [27]बिन्दुयत्नयुक्सन्धिगान्यथ ।
विलासः परिसर्पश्च विधूतं शमनर्मणी ॥ ८३ ॥

नर्मद्युतिः प्रगमनं विरोधः पर्युपासनम् ।
वज्रं पुष्पमुपन्यासो वर्णसंहार इत्यपि ॥ ८४ ॥

26 See the Introduction

27. *binduyatnayuk sandhi is pratimukhasandhi*

सम्भोगेच्छा विलासः स्याद्; [28]दृष्टनष्टानुसर्पणम्।
परिसर्पोऽनिष्टवस्तुनिक्षेपः स्याद् विधूतकम्॥ ८५॥

शमोऽरत्युपशमो; नर्म स्यात् परिहासवाक्।
अनुरागोद्घाटनोत्था प्रीतिर्नर्मद्युतिः स्मृता॥ ८६॥

पात्रपानुवाक्यैः स्वस्यानुरागबीजप्रकाशनम्।
प्रगमः; छद्मनाभीष्टागमरोधो[29] विरोधकः॥ ८७॥

पर्युपासनमिष्टस्य जनस्यानुनयो भवेत्।
वज्रं निष्ठुरवाक्; पुष्पमनुरागोल्बणं वचः॥ ८८॥

उपन्यासो भवेद् रागहेतुवाक्यप्रपञ्चनम् ।
चातुर्वर्ण्यप्रवचनं वर्णसंहार इष्यते ॥ ८९ ॥

परिसर्पप्रगमवज्रोपन्यासाश्च पुष्पकम् ।
मुख्यान्यत्राथ गर्भस्य पताकाप्त्याशिकायुजः ॥ ९० ॥

अभूताहरणं मार्गो रूपोदाहरणक्रमाः ।
सङ्ग्रहश्चानुमानञ्च तोटकाधिबले तथा ॥ ९१ ॥

उद्वेगसम्भ्रमाक्षेपा द्वादशाङ्गान्यनुक्रमात् ।
अभूताहरणं प्रस्तुतोपयोगि च्छलाश्रयम्[30] ॥ ९२ ॥

मार्गो याथार्थ्यकथनं ; रूपमूह्योदयं वचः ।
प्रस्तुतोत्कर्षाभिधानं स्याद् उदाहरणं ; क्रमः ॥ ९३ ॥

30 The MS reads *chalārjavam* The DR has *abhūtāharaṇam chadma* (1-38).

त्रिभिर्नाभिः ; प्रस्तुतोपयोगि चान्यं तु मङ्ग्रहः ।
लिङ्गादभ्यूहनञ्चानुमानं ; गेयाद् मयोदितम् ॥ ९४ ॥

तोटकं स्याद् ; पधिरमिति यश्चान्मीरितम् ।
[31]सपत्नाज्जिनाद् भीतिरुद्वेगः ; सम्भ्रमः पुनः ॥ ९५ ॥

शङ्कात्रासौ ; अथाक्षेप इष्टार्थोपायसङ्ग्रहः ।
मार्या ह्री तोटकाक्षेपाधिवल्गान्यत्र युत्पन. ॥ ९६ ॥

विदुर्विमर्शान्याङ्गानि निव्याविप्रवर्गायुतः ।
तमापवादः सम्फेटो विद्रवद्रवशक्तयः ॥ ९७ ॥

द्युतिः प्रसङ्गश्छलनं व्यवसायो विरोधनम् ।
प्ररोचनं विचलनम् आदानञ्च मर्यादा ॥ ९८ ॥

अपवादस्तु दोषाणां प्रख्यापनमुदाहृत. ।
रोपालापस्तु सम्फेटो ; विद्रवः स्याद् वधादिकम् ॥९९ ॥

द्रवो गुरुतिरस्कारः ; शक्तिर्वैरिनिरासनम् ।
तर्जनोद्वेजनद्वन्द्वं द्युतिः स्याद् ; गुरुकीर्तनम् ॥ १०० ॥

प्रसङ्गं प्राहुर् ; अवमाननं छलनमीरितम् ।
व्यवसायः स्वसामर्थ्यप्रशंसनमुदाहृतम् ॥ १०१ ॥

[31a]क्रोधसंरब्धयोरन्योन्याधिक्षेपो विरोधनम् ।
सिद्धवद् [32]भाविपच्छ्रेयःकथन स्यात् प्ररोचनम् ॥ १०२ ॥

31a The MS reads *krodhasambaddhayoh* The DR has *samrabdhānām virodhanam* (1-47).

32 The meaning intended seems to be *bhāvinah śreyasah kathanam yat tat* But it is a cumbersome expression

स्वगुणाविष्कृतिः स्यात् विचलनं ; कार्यसङ्ग्रहः ।
[33]आदानं ; निर्वहस्याङ्गान्यथ कार्यफलस्पृशः ॥ १०३ ॥

सन्धिर्विरोधो[34] ग्रथनं निर्णयः परिभाषणम् ।
प्रसादानन्दसमयाः कृतिर्भाषोपगूहने ॥ १०४ ॥

पूर्वभावोपसंहारौ प्रशस्तिश्च चतुर्दश ।
बीजोपगमनं सन्धिर्विरोधः कार्यमार्गणम् ॥ १०५ ॥

कार्योपक्षेपणं प्रादुर्भवनं ; निर्णय पुनः ।
बीजानुगुणकार्यस्य प्रख्यापनम् ; भवो मिथ ॥ १०६ ॥

अपवादस्तु दोषाणां प्रख्यापनमुदाहृतः ।
रोषालापस्तु सम्फेटो ; विद्रवः स्याद् वधादिकम् ॥ ९९ ॥

द्रवो गुरुतिरस्कारः ; शक्तिर्वैरिनिरासनम् ।
तर्जनोद्वेजनद्वन्द्वं द्युतिः स्याद् ; गुरुकीर्तनम् ॥ १०० ॥

प्रसङ्गं प्राहुर् ; अवमाननं छलनमीरितम् ।
व्यवसायः स्वसामर्थ्यप्रशंसनमुदाहृतम् ॥ १०१ ॥

[31a]क्रोधसंरब्धयोरन्योन्याधिक्षेपो विरोधनम् ।
सिद्धवद् [32]भाविपच्छ्रेयःकथनं स्यात् प्ररोचनम् ॥ १०२ ॥

31a. The MS reads *krodhasambaddhayoh*. The DR has *samrabdhānām virodhanam* (1-47)

32. The meaning intended seems to be *bhāvinah śreyasah kathanam yat tat*. But it is a cumbersome expression

स्वगुणाविष्कृतिः स्यात् विचलनं ; कार्यसङ्ग्रहः ।
[33]आदानं ; निर्विद्धस्याङ्गान्यथ कार्यफलस्पृहाः ॥ १०३ ॥

सन्धिर्विरोधो[34] ग्रथनं निर्णयः परिभाषणम् ।
प्रसादानन्दसमयाः कृतिर्भाषोपगूहने ॥ १०४ ॥

पूर्वभावोपसंहारो प्रशस्तिश्च चतुर्दश ।
बीजोपगमनं सन्धिर्विरोधः कार्यमार्गणम् ॥ १०५ ॥

कार्योपक्षेपणं प्राहुर्ग्रथनं ; निर्णयः पुनः ।
बीजानुगुणकार्यस्य प्रख्यापनम् ; मथो मिथ ॥ १०६ ॥

जल्पनं परिभाषा स्यात्; प्रसादः पर्युपासनम् ।
आनन्दो वाञ्छितप्राप्तिः; समयो दुःखनाशनम् ॥ १०७ ॥

कृतिर्लब्धस्थिरीकारः; प्राप्तकार्यानुमोदनम् ।
आभाषणं; विचित्रार्थप्राप्तिः स्याद् उपगूहनम् ॥ १०८ ॥

इष्टकार्येक्षणं पूर्वभाव ; कार्योपसंहृतिः[35] ।
संहारः स्यात्; प्रशस्तिस्तु शुभाशंसनमीरितम् ॥१०९ ॥

दशोत्तरशतश्लोकैर्दशरूपकपद्धतिः ।
दर्शिता साधु कुरविकुलक्षीराम्बुधीन्दुना ॥ ११० ॥
[36]रामसङ्ख्यायता; कृत्या प्रीयतां शाङ्गोऽनया ॥ ११०½ ॥

श्रीपरमेश्वरार्पणमस्तु ।

दशरूपकपद्धतौ निर्दिष्टानां पारिभाषिकशब्दानां सूची

(सङ्ख्याः श्लोकक्रमनिर्देशिकाः)

Appendix I

A DIFFICULT ILLUSTRATIVE VERSE IN THE *DAŚARŪPĀVALOKA*

Appendix I

*A DIFFICULT ILLUSTRATIVE VERSE IN THE *DAŚARŪPĀVALOKA*

In my article on the *Daśarūpaka* published in the Journal of the University of Gauhati, Vol XI, 1960 (ARTS), I tried to discuss some of the problems connected with Dhanika's *Avaloka* on the *Dasarūpaka* I could not find then definite solutions to many of the problems, and I only offered my suggestions in several cases, and in one case I produced some intepretations that were supplied to me by some well-known scholars in the field when I referred the matter to them One of the problems I was struggling hard to find a solution to, was a Prakrit[1] verse given by Dhanika in the fourth chapter under *kārikā* 34 (page 91, N S P edition, 1941)

The text of the verse as available in print was highly unintelligible, and before publishing my paper I wrote to Professor Dr A N Upādhye of Kolhapur, requesting him to furnish me with the *chāyā* of the verse under reference and the source thereof etc if possible On receiving my letter Professor Upādhye also consulted some of his friends in this matter, and supplied me with a *chāyā* of his own rendering and a second one by one of them These two *chāyas* and the interpretations were purely tentative, and I produced them as such with the same remark in my paper on the *Daśarūpaka* referred to above

*Paper read at the meeting of the American Oriental Society, Berkeley, California March 1963

1 I am using the word Prakrit in a general way in the sense of any vernacular derived from and akin to Sanskrit, including even the lowest forms of the dialect just as the one in the expression *Prākrta vyakarana* used by Trivikrama and Hemacandra covers all dialects including Apabhraṃśa

Appendix I

*A DIFFICULT ILLUSTRATIVE VERSE IN THE *DAŚARUPĀVALOKA*

In my article on the *Daśarūpaka* published in the Journal of the University of Gauhati, Vol XI, 1960 (ARTS), I tried to discuss some of the problems connected with Dhanika's *Avaloka* on the *Daśarūpaka* I could not find then definite solutions to many of the problems, and I only offered my suggestions in several cases, and in one case I produced some intepretations that were supplied to me by some well-known scholars *in the field when I referred the matter to them* One of the problems I was struggling hard to find a solution to, was a Prakrit[1] verse given by Dhanika in the fourth chapter under *kārikā* 34 (page 91, N S P edition, 1941)

The text of the verse as available in print was highly unintelligible, and before publishing my paper I wrote to Professor Dr A N Upādhye of Kolhapur, requesting him to furnish me with the *chayā* of the verse under reference and the source thereof etc if possible On receiving my letter Professor Upādhye also consulted some of his friends in this matter, and supplied me with a *chāyā* of his own rendering and a second one by one of them These two *chayās* and the interpretations were purely tentative, and I produced them as such with the same remark in my paper on the *Daśarūpaka* referred to above

*Paper read at the meeting of the American Oriental Society, Berkeley, California March 1963

1 I am using the word Prakrit in a general way in the sense of any vernacular derived from and akin to Sanskrit, including even the lowest forms of the dialect just as the one in the expression *Prakrta vyakarana* used by Trivikrama and Hemacandra covers all dialects including Apabhraṃsa.

Several years after the publication of that paper containing the two *chāyās* and the possible interpretations conveyed by Dr Upādhye and Dr P. L. Vaidya, I noticed recently a[2] paper on the same verse appearing in the H. D. Velankar Commemoration Volume which was published in October, 1965 The writer of this paper remarks on page 197 thus "No modern commentator or scholar has offered, to my knowledge, any interpretation of the verse." The odd thing about this, as I understand from a recent letter (November 8, 1967) written to me by Professor A N. Upādhye, is that this person was also one of the many to whom this verse together with the problems raised by me, was shown by Professor Upādhye Therefore it is surprising that no acknowledgement of any sort or reference to Dr Upādhye and Dr Vaidya, or to the tentative inter-

2 The title of the paper "An obscure Apabhramśa verse quoted in the *Dasarupa*" is not accurate. The verse occurs in the *Avaloka*, and not in the *Daśarūpa*. Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha says in the beginning

Dasarūpasya yā vyākhyā dhanikena samīritā,
tasyā bhaṭṭanṛsiṃhena laghvī ṭīkā vidhīyate |

One or two points in the paper, though very minor, are surprising, and therefore I should like to pointing them out here, with the intention of facilitating future corrections The writer of that paper says on p 197.

(a) "The commentator of the *Avaloka* is constrained to remark *nitānta-asphuṭatvād asya ślokasya vyākhyā na likhyate asmābhiḥ*" The spacing in the compound-form is of course given by the writer of the paper This remark was not made by the commentator (or the author) of the *Avaloka*, but it was by the editor of the text No commentary on the *Avaloka* was published by the N S Press, and the above sentence seems to have been quoted from the N.S P. edition of the *Daśarūpaka*, though there is no reference to the particular edition from which he has quoted this

(b) On page 198 (and twice again on page 200) he gives the ablative and genitive form of *anya* in feminine in Sanskrit as *anyāyāḥ* (in the last but one paragraph) *Anya* being a pronoun, the form should have been *anyasyāḥ*

pretations supplied by them, appears in this recent article of the year 1965 Instead of making the necessary acknowledgement and a reference to these scholars, his remarks to the contrary (quoted above) seem to be unfair and unscholarly

He has collected some different readings of the verse in the *Avaloka*, and has tried to explain its meaning and application in the context Instead of reproducing his interpretations and the details, I should like to request the interested readers to see for themselves the paper appearing in the H D Velankar Commemoration Volume

Now I should turn to the problem of the original verse and the *chāyā* and to the possible solution that I have been able to gather from genuine sources Even after the publication of my paper in 1960, many of the problems in the *Avaloka* have not ceased to engage my attention Dhanika's *Avaloka* is a highly learned Commentary, and naturally it bristles with many difficulties to which the defective editions available in print add further, and consequently I found it very hard to overcome these difficulties without the help of a suitable sub-commentary In my search for such a help, only recently I was able to get the transcripts of Bhattanrsimha's Commentary, called *Laghutikā*, on the *Avaloka* I have just completed working on this *Laghutīkā* and the *Daśarūpāvaloka* [2a] I feel that though

2a I am glad to inform that the authorities of the Adyar Library and Research Centre Madras are publishing soon the entire work on the *Dasarupaka* consisting of the text the *Avaloka* with corrections in 347 places the brilliant commentary of Bhattanrsimha, an Introduction and two separate Footnotes, etc The work will appear as number 97 of the well known Adyar Library Series and may come to about 360 pages in Demy Octavo size

very brief the commentary seems to prove very useful in settling the various readings and the interpretations of the text of the *Avaloka*

In the case of this difficult Apabhramśa verse also some welcome light is thrown by Bhaṭṭanṛsimha, and it is he who comes to our help in getting a solution for the first time to this otherwise unyielding and intractable illustiation I submit here what I have been able to collect from the manuscript material of his *laghuṭīkā* in this connection Bhattanrsimha gives this Apabhramśa verse with a *different reading, and its chāyā*[3] *I quote the portion* here, with some corrections effected by me, consisting of the verse and the Sanskrit *chāya* together with his comments thereon

(भट्टनृसिंहस्य लघुटीका)

व्यवधानेन अविरोधमुदाहरन्ति ·—

अण्णाउ [4]ताउ महिला जह परिमलसुअंधु ।
मह कंतह अलीणउ[4] वणवीसअंगंधु ॥

3 The reading of the verse available in print without *chāyā* is this

annahunāhumahelıahujuhuparımalusuauamdhu,
muhukamtaha agatthahaamga na phittaı gamdhu |

4 The spacing in this verse is mine The manuscript reads in a continuous way Sometimes in the Telugu *Ms* an *anusvāra* or *anusvara* like symbol (or zero called *nolli*, according to Dr Upādhye in his letter who adds that it was the case with Kannada manuscripts too—I noticed it also in the Grantha MS—) is used before a consonant to indicate that the following consonant is to be duplicated Consequent on this practice the two words *amnau* and *amlinau* are found with this symbol and I have given them in the text with the consonants duplicated

(छाया)

अन्यास्ता महिला यथा परिमलसुगन्धाः
मम कान्तस्य आश्रितो[5] नणविसगन्धः ॥

अत्रान्यासामसौभाग्यं[6] तत्प्रियतमानामशौर्यञ्च स्वसौभाग्यप्रकटनेन स्वभर्तुः[7] शौर्यप्रकटनेन च स्वात्मनो निन्दान्याजेन[7] काचिद् ब्रूते । अन्याः खलु ताः स्त्रियो यासामङ्गरागानुकूलश्चिरस्थायी परिमल. । मम तु निर्भाग्यायाः कृतेऽप्यङ्गरागे भर्तृव्रणकृतविसगन्ध एवेत्यर्थ. ।

In the Avaloka Dhanikas' remarks on this verse run thus

इत्यत्र बीभत्सस्य अङ्गभूतरसान्तरस्यव्यवधानेन शृङ्गारे समावेशो न विरुद्धः ।

While explaining the verse IV-34 of the *Daśarupaka* containing the definition of *sthāyibhāva*, Dhanika's *Avaloka* has a lengthy and a very learned discussion related to the topic A part of the discussion is devoted to the question of opposition or incompatibility (*virodha*)

(1) between *sthayibhavas* and *vyabhicaribhāvas*, and
(2) between *two sthāyibhāvas*.

Of the second type again two possibilities are mentioned

(a) One is an instance where, though the two are incompatible, one *sthāyibhāva* is *angin* and the other an *anga*, and the *ālambana-vibhāvas* of the two are different,

5 The Telugu manuscript reads *aśrite*, but Madras Govt. transcript, Adyar Grantha Ms and the Trivandrum transcript — all give *āsrito*, and so I have given this

6 The Telugu Ms reads *atrasām* etc Madras Govt. transcript reads *atrānyāsām*, whereas the Trivandrum transcript gives *yadanyāsām* I Preferred *atranyāsām*

7 The portion from *svabhartuh* to *nindāvyājena* is left out in the Telugu Ms whereas the Madras transcript, the Adyar Grantha Ms and the Trivandrum transcript—all these contain the reading

(b) and the second may be a case where again, of the two incompatibles, one *sthāyibhāva* is *angin* and the other an *anga,* and the *ālambanavibhāvas* of the two are not different, but one and the same.

Here Dhanika says that the first instance of the second type is all right, and it is possible to have in a composition (descriptions of appropriate elements of) such incompatible *rasas* (or the *sthāyibhāvas*[8] as is understood from the expression in the context) because of the fact that the *ālambanavibhāvas* are different, and that the second instance of the second type should be avoided (*Avaloka* has this sentence *viruddharasaikalambanatvam eva virodhahetuh,* and on this *Bhattanrsimha* comments *sthāyino rasasya angabhutair api rasāntarair ekāśrayatvam pariharanīyam ity arthah* See Appendix II) Or, says Dhanika, this too may be possible in spite of the fact that the *ālambanavibhāva* of the two is one and the same, if there be (appropriate elements of) a third intervening *rasa* which is *not incompatible* with either of the two (The following remark of Dhanika *sa tv aviruddharasāntaravyavadhānenopanibadhyamāno na virodhī* is introduced by Bhaṭṭanrsimha thus *kim tat sarvathā tyajanīyam eva teṣām ekāśrayatvam ? nety āha—sa tv iti*) Otherwise, without the intervention of such a third *rasa* the second instance of the second type should be avoided (Dhanika remarks *prakārāntarena ekāśrayavirodhah*

8 As it is the *sthāyibhāva* which when fully developed becomes the *rasa,* the term *rasa* is also used in this context to stand for the *sthāyibhāva* A similar usage of the term is found in other treatises too, and it is so explained by Abhinava as well (*bhāvinīṃ vṛttim āśritya odanaṃ pacatītivad*).

parihartavyah, and on this Bhattanrsimha comments *prakarantarena=avyavadhānena,* i e *aviruddha-rasantarāvyavadhānena*)

The Prakrit verse in the context is given by Dhanika for the second instance of the second type with the intervention of a third *rasa,* which is not incompatible with the *angin* as well as the *angarasa,* and of this verse Bhattanrsimha's *lakhutika* gives the above reading, the *chāyā* and his own comments

Even in the reading as given by Bhattanrsimha I felt some difficulty in the fourth *pāda* of the Prakrit verse After referring this point to him I got a kind reply from Professor Dr Upādhye, the relevant contents of which I shall be mentioning soon The point of difficulty is this I learn from the *Prakrta-Sabda-Mahārnava* (P S M) that *vissa* or *visa* are the Prakrit forms for the *visra* of Sanskrit The *chāyā* in the manuscripts clearly reads as *(vrana)-visragandhah* for which the Prakrit form should have been *(vana)-vissagamdhu* or *visagamdhu* But the reading in a manuscript (Telugu) seems to contain the spelling as *(vana) visa*ra*agamdhu* And here again the syllable "ra" (it looks like "ra") is seen in a smaller size and slightly above the level of the other letters It was perhaps inserted by the scribe later, though there is no insertion mark visible

I It was not clear to me as to whether I should take the form as *visaraagamdhu* or *visaagamdhu* or *visagamdhu* Sometimes in the Prakrit forms *svarthe kah* (Cf Trivikrama's *Prākrta-vyākarana-vrtti* 2-1-18) is permitted of which only "a" remains (except in the Paisacī where the entire form is said to be retained), although the corresponding Sanskrit form may not

actually have the similar *svārthe kah*[9] The examples given are *candrah=can·dao,* and *iha=ihaa* (Trivikrama, 2-1-18)

II About the metre of the verse too I had my doubts From looking into Hemacandra's *Chando'nuśāsana,* I thought it might be *pañcānanalalitā* (*same daśa oje dvādaśa pañcānanalalitā,* p 204, edited by Professor Velankar, 1961, i e ten and twelve *mātras* in the even and odd *pādas* respectively) On my request for a clarification on these points Professor Upādhye was kind enough to write to me (on November 8, 1967) stating that *vīsaraagamdhu* could be taken as the form in the context, and that the metre might be *makaradhvajahāsa* (*same ekādaśa oje dvādaśa makaradhvajahāsah,* Ibid p 205)

I had to write to him again as I felt some difficulty in adopting the form *vīsaraagamdhu,* because except in the case of some specific forms (śrī etc, Cf Trivi 1-4-99, and others), the "r" occurring as the final of the conjunct consonants is elided in the Prakrit forms as is recorded in *ro lukam adhah* (Trivi 2-3-5), and therefore it did not seem possible to retain the "r" of the *visra* of Sanskrit in the Prakrit forms I also asked for his opinion as to whether there was anything wrong in taking the verse to be in the metre of *pañcānanalalitā,* as its definition seemed to be applicable here too

In his second letter of the 12th December, 1967, Professor Upādhye informed me that if the *mātrās*

9 I am indebted to Professor Upādhye for this information also In Sanskrit however *visraka* is rarely found *Śārngadharasamhita* (3-12-9) has the following

pittam pitena haritam nīlam śyāvañ ca visrakam In the *chāyā* of the verse in this context no manuscript gives *visraka*

agreed any name could be suggested for the metre of the verse, and that that way the Apabhramsa[10] left "a broad margin" for different opinions He also stated that retention of "r" after *svarabhakti* was not impossible in the Apabhramsa Finally he however conveyed his opinion that if the reading *vīsaa-* be found that was quite welcome

Here I should mention that the transcript of the Madras Govt Oriental MSS Library reads in this place as *visagamdhua*, whereas the Trivandrum transcript gives as *visaamgamdhasu* The Grantha manuscript (Adyar) seems to be corrupt I therefore felt like depending upon the Telugu manuscript, and taking the expression as *visaagamdhu*,[11] and after some corrections about which I have discussed in the notes, I chose the reading of the relevant portion as given before on page 52

From the comments of Bhattanrsimha in this context it appears that in this verse a particular lady was praising other ladies for their sweet smell which was lasting long and was agreeable to the cosmetics they used and that at the same time she was deploring *her own self because of the fact that whatever be her* make-up, with her it was (always) the smelling of a raw meat (*visragandha*) caused by the wounds on the body of her husband (who being a valorous warrior

10 Different opinions are not uncommon in Sanskrit too An instance of an *aupacchandasika* coming under *matra chandas* in the *Vrttaratnakara* is given the name of *māla bharini* and treated under *ardhasamavrttas* by Hemacandra.

11 By applying the *svarthe kah* we can get the form *visaa* in the Prakrit although the Sanskrit here does not have *visraka* where all the manuscripts read only *visra*

used to sustain them in the course of his (various battles) This is only a seeming praise for the other ladies, and the intended implication is that she was really fortunate in having for her a husband who was an illustrious warrior, and it was the other ladies who were not fortunate because of the fact that their husbands were cowards and consequently never stayed in the battle-field for any time, as it should be evident from the absence of any such wounds on their bodies

Here in spite of the fact that one is the *angin* (*srngara*) and the other the *angarasa*, the two *rasas* *bibhatsa* and *srngāra* are opposed to each other, and although the *alambanavibhāva* is the same person (her husband, the courageous hero), yet it is possible to have the *two* because of the intervening *virarasa*, as there is no *bādhyabādhakabhāva*[12] between *srngāra* and *vīra* and between *vira* and *bībhatsa*[13] Therefore the aesthetic experience in this case is not adversely affected

The intervening *rasa* in this instance seems to be *vīrarasa* because of the cemments *svabhartuh śaurya-prakatanena tatpriyatamānām asauryam kacid brūte* by Bhaṭṭanrsimha and need not be the *hasyarasa* as was once tentatively surmised This seems to be corroborated by a reading of the relevant sentence of the

12 It is possible for a person to love his wife and at the same time to be an illustrious warrior Similarly, in spite of some wounds on the body of her husband the wife can still love him or more so for these very wounds which may make her feel proud because these are symbols of his valour in fighting courageously in the battles

13 The *viruddharasas* are mentioned thus
srngarabibhatsarasau tathā virabhayānakau,
raudradbhutau tatha hāsyakarunau vairinau mithah |
(*Śrngāratilaka*)

Avaloka in a manuscript[14] (Telugu) of the Adyar Library, running as

> *ity atra bībhatsasya vīrarasavyavadhānena*
> *śrngāre samaveśo na viruddhah*
> (page 50, MS 68287)

This sentence coming as a comment by Dhanika on the Prakrit verse is found in the place of the one available in print, which was quoted earlier on page 53

From these available data it should be possible for us to set aside all unnecessary conjectures regarding this once-difficult illustrative verse I feel that the portion of the *Laghutikā* of Bhattanrsimha given above on page 52-53 may be taken as representing a genuine source and affording a correct interpretation Personally, after several years of hard struggle in the matter, I feel very happy for the solution to the mysteries of this verse, which has been made possible by the learned comments of the great Bhattanrsimha

14 This manuscript however gives a different reading of the Apabhramsa verse and without *chaya*, the merits of which I do not propose to discuss here

APPENDIX II

CORRECTED TEXT OF THE PORTION OF THE *AVALOKA*

on verse IV-34 of the *Daśarūpaka*

with

Bhaṭṭanṛsimha's Commentary, the *Laghuṭīkā*

APPENDIX II

CORRECTED TEXT OF THE PORTION OF THE *AVALOKA*

on verse IV-34 of the *Dasarupaka*

with

Bhattanrsimha's Commentary, the *Laghutika*

As the Apabhramśa verse discussed in my paper (given as Appendix I) forms the final part of the continuous topic dealt with in the preceding lines of the *Avaloka*, and as this portion of the *Avaloka* too as available in print has many mistakes, I thought of giving here the relevant portion of Bhattanrsimha's commentary, and the related text of the *Avaloka* based on a Telugu manuscript of the Adyar Library, Madras, with some corrections which in my opinion were needed It is my sincere hope that the portion of the commentary and the text given here will facilitate a better understanding of the topic

I am delighted to express my hearty thanks and acknowledgement to the authorities of the Adyar Library, of the Govt Oriental MSS Library, Madras, and of the Trivandrum MSS Library, now of the University of Kerala, for their kindness in supplying me with the following material

(1) Microfilm copy of the Palm-leaf Telugu Ms of *Avaloka* and DR, with the number 68287, Adyar Library,

(2) Microfilm copy of Palm-leaf Telugu Ms of Bhattanrsimha's Comm (75365) Adyar Library,

(3) Microfilm copy of Palm-leaf Grantha Ms of Bhaṭṭanrsimha's Comm (70066) Adyar Library,

(4) Transcript of last item (70066) Adyar Library,

(5) Transcript of Bhaṭṭanrsimha's Comm R 2421, Madras Govt Oriental MSS Library,

(6) Transcript of Bhaṭṭanrsimha's Comm 1974-B, Oriental MSS Library, Trivandrum

As I hope to discuss at a later stage different readings and allied matters of the manuscripts of the commentary, I do not propose to discuss them now After a careful collation of the different copies at my disposal I have selected and given the readings in this portion, which I thought to be suitable and necessary on the basis of the evidence available

(धनिकस्य दशरूपावलोक :— ४-३४)

अथ स्थायी :—

विरुद्धैरविरुद्धैर्वा भावैर्विच्छिद्यते न यः ।
आत्मभावं नयत्यन्यान् स स्थायी लवणाकरः ॥ ४-३४

सजातीयविजातीयभावान्तरैरतिरस्कृतत्वेनोपनिबध्यमानो रत्यादिः स्थायी। यथा बृहत्कथायां नरवाहनदत्तस्य [1]मदनमञ्जर्यामनुरागः तत्तदवान्तरनायिकानुरागैरतिरस्कृत. स्थायी। यथा च मालतीमाधवे श्मशानाङ्के बीभत्सेन मालत्यनुरागस्य अतिरस्कारो " मम हि प्राक्तनोपलम्भसम्भावि-

1 Printed text (NSP edn 1941) reads Madanamañjūṣayām

तात्मजन्मनः संस्कारस्यानवरतप्रबोधात् प्रतायमानस्तद्विसदृशैः प्रत्ययान्तरै-रतिरस्कृतप्रवाहः प्रियतमाप्रत्ययोत्पत्तिसन्तानस्तन्मयमिव करोति [2]वृत्तिसारू-प्यतश्चैतन्यम् " इत्यादिनोपनिबद्धः । तदनेन प्रकारेण विरोधिनामविरोधि-नाञ्च समावेशो न विरोधी ।

2 Printed text has "*antarvṛtti-*".

(भट्टनृसिंहस्य लघुटीका)

विरुद्धैरविरुद्धैर्वेति । अस्यार्थः=विरुद्धैरविरुद्धैर्वा भावैर्य आहित: संस्कारो न विच्छेदी भवति, प्रत्युत तान् सर्वान् आत्मभावं नयति, स स्थायी भावो लवणाकरः । लवणाकरवल्लवणाकरः । उक्तं हि :—

" यथा रुचकानां लवणाकरेषु मेरौ यथा बीजवल्लभमृमौ
यज्जायते तन्मयमेव तत् स्यात् " इति ।
(तन्त्रवार्तिकम्-आनन्दाश्रम-पुटे २०७)

विरुद्धाविरुद्धाविच्छेदित्वमन्यद् अनुत्पाद्येतिवृत्तेषु अन्यद् उत्पाद्ये-तिवृत्तेषु च प्रबन्धेषु [1]दृष्टमित्याह-यथेत्यादिना ।

1 Adyar Grantha Ms reads ; *viruddhāvicchedatvam anyat utpādyetivratesu utpādyetivṛttesu pṛstam ityāha* The Telugu Ms (Adyar) and Madras Govt *transcript* give as *viruddhaviruddhāvicchedıtvam anutpādyetivṛttesu* On I-15 of the DR Bhattanṛsimha explains before that *prakhyāta* is of two types *itihāsakathātah prasiddham, lokakathatah prasiddham* And about *utpādya* he says *yatra itivṛttam kavibuddhyaiva kalpyate tad utpādyam* From this it appears that any *itivṛtta* based on *bṛhatkathā* (i e *lokakathā*) is treated by him as *lokakathātah prakhyātam* (i e *anutpādya*) and the story of *Mālatimādhava* will be *utpādyam* As both are cited in the *Avaloka* for illustration, I think that the sentence intended here must have reference to both. Therefore I gave it as *anyad anutpādyetivṛttesu anyad utpādyetivṛttesu ca prabadndhesu dṛstam ityāha*

(अवलोकः)

तथाहि । कथं विरोधः ? सहानवस्थानम् , बाध्यबाधकभावो वा ? उभयरूपो[3] न तावत्। स्वादात्मनि[4] तस्य एकरूपत्वेनाविर्भावात् । स्थायिनां विभावादीनां[5] च यदि विरोधः, तत्रापि न तावत् सहानवस्थानम् । रत्याद्युपरक्ते चेतसि स्रक्सूत्रन्यायेन अविरोधिनां व्यभिचारिणां विरोधिनां चोपनिबन्धः समस्तभावकस्वसंवेदनसिद्धः । यथैव च स्वसंवेदनसिद्धस्तथैव काव्यव्यापारसंरम्भेण अनुकार्येऽप्यावेश्यमानः स्वचेतस्संभेदेन[6] तथाविधानन्दसंविदुन्मीलनहेतुः सम्पद्यते ।

तस्मान्न तावद् भावानां सहानवस्थानम् । बाध्यबाधकभावो[7] हि भावान्तरैर्भावान्तरतिरस्कारः । स च व्यभिचारिणा स्थायिना न विरोधः[8] (सम्भवति) । व्यभिचारिभिः (च) स्थायिनो न विरुद्धाः[9]। तेषामङ्गत्वात् ।

3 NSP edition gives *ubhayarupenāpi*

4 This is a better reading than *tādatmyasya eka-* etc given in print

5 It is not clear why it is *vibhāvadinām* As he is discussing the *virodha* between *sthāyibhāva* and *vyabhicāri-bhāva, bhavādinām* perhaps would be suitable I do not know whether *vyabhicārins* are also referred to as *vibhāvas* in any text

6 Adyar Ms (Telugu) reads *svasamvedanena* But I have given the reading according to the *pratīka* cited by Bhaṭṭanṛsimha

7 Printed text has *bādhyabādhakabhāvas tu*, but what is given above is the *pratika* in the commentary

8 Adyar Ms reads *viruddhah* and without *sambhavati* The reading given above is based on the interpretation and wording of Bhaṭṭanṛsimha

9 The MS reads *viddhāh* which is obviously a mistake of the scribe

प्रधानविरुद्धस्य चाङ्गत्वायोगात्। आनन्तर्यविरोधोऽपि[10] अनेनैव[11] प्रकारेणापास्तः (सन्) न सम्भवति[12]। तथा च मालतीमाधवे शृङ्गारानन्तरं बीभत्सोपनिबन्धेऽपि न किञ्चिद् वैरस्यम्।

तदेवमवस्थिते[13] विरुद्धरसैकालम्बनत्वमेव विरोधहेतु.[14]। स तु अविरुद्धरसान्तरव्यवधानेनोपनिबध्यमानो न विरोधी। यथा :-

10 MS reads *-virodhitvam api* Bhattanrsimha gives the above reading

11 MS reads *anena prakārena* Bhattanrsimha gives *anenaiva prakārena*

12 Printed text and MS have *apāstam bhavati*

13 Perhaps the reading was *avasthito* Or else we may supply *sthāyinah sthāyyantarena virodha ity asmin visaye* to be construed with the locative *avasthite*.

14 Printed text has *virodhe hetuh*

(लघुटीका)

अविच्छेदं प्रतिज्ञातमुपपादयति तथाहीत्यादिना। कथमिति[1-a]। अत्र स्थायिनः स्थाय्यन्तरेण विरोधस्तावत् तिष्ठतु। किं तु स्थायिनः परिपोषकतया निधीयमाना विभावादय एव यदि तं विरुन्ध्युस्तर्हि का गतिरिति चेत् तत्राह—स्थायिनां विभावादीनाञ्च यदि विरोध इति। हेतुमाह— रत्याद्युपरक्ते इति। यदा हि रत्याद्युपरक्तं भवति मनस्तदा तद्विरोधिनां जुगुप्सादीनाम् अविरोधिनामुत्कण्ठादीनां तेन रत्यादिना

1a From the commentary it appears that there was perhaps the reading of *katham* before *virodhah* in the *Avaloka*

सद्भावो दृष्टः । यथाशुक्लकृष्णपुष्पसम्भेदेऽपि अनुस्यूतस्य सवसूत्रस्येत्यर्थः । न केवलं दर्शनमेव । तथैवोपनिबन्धोऽपीत्याह-यथैवेति । स्वचेतस्सम्भेदेनेति । वक्ष्यति हि रसाविर्भावप्रकारमुपपादयन्

"स्वादः काव्यार्थसम्भेदादात्मानन्दसमुद्भव " इति। (४–४३)

एवं स्थितं सहानवस्थानमुपसंहरति— तस्मादिति । बाध्यबाधकभावलक्षणस्य विरोधस्याप्यभावं वर्णयन् तत्स्वरूपं तावदाह — बाध्यबाधकभावो हीति । स हि रत्याद्याहितसंस्कारस्य भावान्तरैर्विच्छेदः। स्वरूपस्य पुनरुत्तरकालीनेन प्रत्ययान्तरेणैव विच्छेदादिति । एवं स्वरूपं परिशोध्य[3]— द्वावेव पक्षौ सम्भवतः; व्यभिचारिभावास्ते विरुन्ध्युताम् , व्यभिचारिणो वा विरुन्ध्युरिति। तत्र तेषां व्यभिचारिभिर्विरोधो न सम्भवति। स्थायित्वात् । व्यभिचारिणाञ्च अस्थायित्वात् । स्थायित्वञ्च विषयरामणीयकेन तेषां सम्भवति । व्यभिचारिणाञ्च अस्थायित्वं स्वरूपमेव "स्थायिन्युन्मग्ननिर्मग्ना" इति वचनात् (दशरूपकम्—४-७) । स्थायिविरुद्धानामपि व्यभिचारित्वं न सम्भवति । तान् प्रति तेषामङ्गत्वात् । प्रधानानुकूलं खल्वङ्गं भवति । न तु तद्विरुद्धम्—[3]इत्याह स चेति । ननु माभूद् यौगपद्येन विरोध । स्थायिभावानन्तरमेव विजातीयानां निबन्धः एकवाक्ये विरुद्ध इत्यस्माभिरुच्यत इति चेत् तत्राह — आनन्तर्यविरोधोऽपीति । अनेनैव प्रकारेण = प्रधानविरुद्धस्याङ्गत्वं न सम्भवतीति प्रकारेण । तदेवं स्वाङ्गभूतैर्भावैः स्थायिभावानां न कश्चिद् विरोध इत्युक्तम् । स्थायिनः स्थाय्यन्तरेण विरोध इति तु परिशिष्यते। तत्राह —

2 Kṛṣṇa is a synonym of *nila* in Sanskrit So here it must mean some blue flowers like *nilotpala*

3 *parisodhya* is connected with *ity aha* coming before *sa ceti*

तदेवमिति। स्थायिनो रसस्य अङ्गभूतैरपि रसान्तरैरेकाश्रयत्वं[4] परिहरणीयमित्यर्थः। किं तत् सर्वथा त्यजनीयमेव तेषाम् एकाश्रयत्वम्? नेत्याह — स त्विति।

After this, comes the portion

vyavadhānena avirodham udāharati, etc

which was given earlier on page 52

4 The *Avaloka* *viruddharasaikālambanatvam eva virodhahetuḥ* is being explained in this sentence Bhattanrsimha by his comment using *ekāsrayatvam* seems to take the two expressions *ekalambanatvam* and *ekāsrayatvam* to convey the same idea, and not in the restricted senses involving a difference between *alambana* and *āsraya* as noted by later writers like Visvanātha and others

ERRATA

Page		Read
10,	line 23	*-bijartha-*
19	verse 4, second line,	*prajñair*
22	Footnote, first line (for than)	then
22	„ third line (for that)	*tat*
24	verse 24, first line	*vithyangaih*
30	verse 54, „ „	*jnâpyam*
32	verse 61, „ „	*ankantapatrair*
50	Footnote, line 8	point
52	line 17	*udaharati*
58	lines 1-2	(various) battles